



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CD  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,730	03/05/2002	Graham Davis	215105.00800	8527
27160	7590	12/13/2004	EXAMINER	
PATENT ADMINISTRATOR KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN 525 WEST MONROE STREET SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60661-3693			YU, MELANIE J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1641	
DATE MAILED: 12/13/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/087,730	DAVIS ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Melanie Yu	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM  
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-62 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-36 and 56 are drawn to a cartridge for sensing at least one analyte, classified in class 422, subclass 50.
  - II. Claims 37-45 are drawn to an analyte sensor with a bioactive layer, classified in class 422, subclass 82.01.
  - III. Claims 46 and 47 are drawn to a method for detecting at least one analyte, classified in class 435, subclass 4.
  - IV. Claims 48-56 and 57 are drawn to a cartridge comprising a first and second vent, classified in class 422, subclass 68.01.
  - V. Claims 58-62 are drawn to a method of measuring the amount of analyte using an electrochemical assay, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions of group I and group II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination of group I as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the analyte sensor of group II does not claim the cartridge of group I, and instead, merely further limits the sensor contained by the cartridge. The cartridge

can comprise other sensors that do not require attached biomolecules, such as a potentiometric sensor, as evidenced by claim 28. The subcombination can be used in combination with a test strip with biomolecules immobilized thereto for detection of analyte. Furthermore, it is noted that the sensor has separate utility such as performing the method of group V.

3. Inventions of a) each of groups I and IV and b) each of groups III and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case either of the products of groups I or IV can perform both of the methods of groups III and V.

4. Inventions of group I and group IV are patentably distinct. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01).

In the instant case the different inventions have different effects. The cartridge of group I requires a valve connected to an opening in a first conduit, which is not required of the cartridge of group IV. The cartridge of group IV requires a vent, which is not required of the cartridge of group I.

5. Inventions of a) group II and b) each of groups III and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different

process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the sensor of group II can be used in either the process of group III or V.

6. Inventions of group II and group IV are patentably distinct. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions the product of group II requires a bioactive layer, which is not required of the product of group IV. The product of group IV requires vents, which is not required of the product of group II.

7. Inventions of group III and group V are patentably distinct. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions. The method of group III requires activating pump means, which is not required of the method of group V. The method of group V requires removing substantially all fluid from the sensor, which is not required of the method of group III.

8. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of M.P.E.P.

**§821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.**

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined.

See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See M.P.E.P. § 804.01.

9. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Each of the species groups A-C listed below each comprise a separate invention under 35 U.S.C. §121.

Group A – The following species each represent the cartridge comprising an enzyme, wherein the enzyme is: urease, glucose oxidase, peroxidase, or alkaline phosphatase.

Group B – The following species each represent the cartridge comprising a substrate, wherein the substrate is: urease, hydrogen peroxide, or molecule having a phosphate or peroxide moiety, ferrocene, p-aminophenol phosphate or D-glucose.

Group C – The following species each represent a microfabricated sensor comprising a biomolecule, wherein the biomolecule is: ionophores, cofactors, polypeptides, proteins, glycopeptides, enzymes, immunoglobulins, antibodies, antigens, lectins, neurochemical receptors, oligonucleotides, polynucleotides, DNA, RNA, human chorionic gonadotrophin, troponin I, troponin T, troponin C, a troponin complex, creatine kinase, creatine kinase subunit M, creatine kinase subunit B, myoglobin, or myosin light chain.

Group D – The following species each represent a microfabricated sensor comprising modified fragments, wherein the modified fragments are generated by: oxidation, reduction, deletion of at least one amino acid, addition of at least one amino acid, chemical modification with a natural moiety, or chemical modification with a synthetic moiety.

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Group A: claim 22 and 33  
Group B: claims 23, 27, and 33  
Group C: claims 42 and 43  
Group D: claim 44.

The species of enzymes and substrates recited above in groups A and B, respectively, require different structures. The biomolecules recited above in group C require different structures and bind to different analyte. The generation of modified fragments as recited in group D each require materially different methods of generation.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 2, 3, and 37 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

10. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melanie Yu whose telephone number is (571) 272-2933. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on (571) 272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Melanie Yu  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1641



LONG V. LE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

12/10/04